

Report 10 of the OC/CIC meeting of May 8,2008

Approximately 53 citizens signed in for the meeting which again took place in the Commissioners' room of the government annex in Brookville. After prayer & the pledge to the American Flag Chairman White opened the meeting at 7PM. The minutes and treasurer's reports were given and discussion then began on Chapter 4 of the Comprehensive Plan. A pamphlet entitled "Understanding Property Rights" from the National Trust for Historic Preservation was made available to all present.

There was discussion of how to finance any further expenditures for the process we are in and it was decided that the Commissioners would continue to pay for expenses incurred until they tell us they cannot. Communications so far have been the expense. By mouth is the best way to get your family, friends and neighbors informed and involved.

Moving on to the discussion of Chapter 4, Ruthie Mannix presented a summary that reflected the issue of the use of the highest projections on the graphs instead a a median, clarified what some of the initials used stand for, that the housing presumed to allow 1 acre per household with variations, that the numbers need to be updated but they do not have a negative impact on the plan, and that residential growth has had the most impact. Also that the last paragraph of the chapter had the most significance.

Further comments made were; no critical errors in Ch. 4, that the projections were wrong by 50-60%, questioning of why the higher projections were accepted, projections 10 years ago were based on the number of permits issued then and no one could predict \$4.00/gal. of gas, it is too late to plan for growth after it happens, suggestion to use 2/3 of highest projections, rural character has been discussed over & over, the graphs should reflect the past 50 years and extrapolate ahead only 10 years instead of 25, the county wants jobs but not a lot of population growth, does the county want all that goes along with job creation, off-shoot businesses more likely here in the county rather than a large plant & its effects, the price of gas now affects what happens in our county, there will be more decentralization due to the high gas prices, we are behind in our tax base, REX will damage our roads if it goes through, we should ask questions of the companies regarding their

requirements such as roads & access, marginal land could be made attractive with a nice road eg; BrookHill, the chapter projections are a “shot in the dark”, the projections are not appropriate, we should insert a note of what has happened thus far rather than making a change, tourism was not looked at & Brookville Lake is a “gift” to Ohio, we should do a narrative of the numbers then versus 2006, we should have more current info but not obligate tax dollars to receive the info, there should be more verbiage about the impact of tourism & future impact.

It was decided to accept chapter 4 as is but to ask the Commissioners for updated statistics.

Chapter 5 discussion was begun by Brian Patterson with a focus on Economic Development on pg. 67. Mr. Ed Derickson distributed color land use maps to all present to aid in the discussion. Points made were; limited interstate access limits Ec. Developm’t, most Ec.Dev. has been in the building trades for residences, there is a great need for Franklin Co. data, in reading this chapter it seems that zoning followed supply & demand, should people who live near the acres zoned industrial have any say in the placing of an industrial park?, the prior statement should be in the Ec. Dev. Goals, we are not changing the Comprehensive plan, just making suggestions of what the people want, the second paragraph on pg. 67 is the reason for Ec. Dev., young professionals leave the county for jobs but now due to the internet can return to this county for jobs, an air park would enhance our county’s ability to attract more businesses, that we are lacking in vision of what it takes to bring in small business, consider fiberoptic investment and other incentives, develop an air park similar to Blue Ash in Ohio and Connersville, In., we need to define “incentives”, define advantages of cluster subdivisions, and finally that someone is playing Monopoly with someone else’s money, that government has no business buying private property, that supply & demand has worked in this country so far, there is no such thing as free money & if we don’t spend it wisely we won’t get more, there is more to economic development than industry, perhaps more tourism, some folks think Honda is the best thing that has happened, response to that was that Honda WANTED to be there, the land was not purchased by government for them and that big business knows more about our county than we do.

Notes on CIC/OC meeting 4.24.08 These notes are the thoughts of Mr. Gary Rieveschl.

Small group discussion of Chapter 5

It eventually became clear to the group that a discussion of Chapter 5 would best be engaged after everyone had introduced themselves to the group and shared their particular personal concerns about its contents. This occupied the group productively for most of the meeting. The remaining time was spent reviewing the several sections of ³Goal² statements in Chapter 5 with the aim of better understanding them.

At meeting's end, the consensus of the group was that the Goals regarding Future Land Use as outlined in the Comprehensive Plan are largely supportable, even though further clarification and characterization would be welcome in many places, especially with respect to the Land Use Map. It was noted that the copy of the Map we were working from was a ³draft².

It was felt by many in the group that while the Goals were useful as generalizations, the derivation of zoning ordinances based on those Goals would not necessarily follow with ease.

It was also agreed that members of the group would each prepare lists of those things they agreed and disagreed with in Chapter 5 and that these lists would be shared with other members of the group.

My comments on Chapter 5 are as follows:

I heartily agree with the underlying principles of land use management outlined in this chapter.

Poorly managed growth and development of such a finite and limited resource as land will adversely affect the character of the whole community as well as the tax rates for property owners. Even if the financial impact of mismanagement can be kept to a quantitative minimum, the qualitative impact on services will be felt across the community, not to speak of the degradation of the character of the community and individual property values.

We would do well to remember that not everyone in the county is a property owner and that property owners have a responsibility to everyone in the county, not just themselves and other property owners, to respect the rights of the community implicit in the common welfare. That is the real common sense and has been since the founding of the nation right along with the individual rights of citizenship we defend and hold so dear. Our Constitution begins with the words ³We the People², not ³We the Property

Owners².

It is the successful balance of individuality and community that makes our country great and should be our shared goal in this process.

I think the beginning of the chapter clearly describes this need for a balanced approach to planning, while acknowledging that property owners have rights that must be respected. My concern is that the rights of the community as a whole that provide the rationale for balance are insufficiently described and need to be more completely outlined in the text.

Nonetheless, the statement of Land Use Goals on page 60 is workable. I do however question the inferred use of ³impact payments² as a management mechanism referred to in Goal #2. Also, the word ³relationship² as it appears in the first two bullet points of Goal #3 needs to be further characterized with the word ³compatible². How the concept of compatibility is defined and applied for each use will require further consensus, but that fact does not disqualify its importance as part of the Goals.

One of the most misunderstood parts of this chapter is the Future Land Use Map. I would direct your attention to the paragraph that spans the bottom of page 60 and the top of page 61. The words ³most appropriate² are highlighted because they are the key to understanding the purpose of the map as a planning tool. While compatibility may be a somewhat more subjective concept, ³appropriateness² as derived from the demonstrable facts of transportation, utilities, soil conditions, slope, floodplain and market preference is not. This map is a guide to visualizing the collective shape of the those real influences on the county and thereby a useful aid in the much more daunting task of drawing actual zoning maps which will be legally binding. This Future Land Use Map does not describe what can or cannot be done in a particular location, it delineates areas where one sort of land management strategy or another would be most appropriately applied in designing zoning regulations.

Like much of the data in the first chapters of the Plan the underlying facts of the Map and the consensus that created it may need to be revisited and updated, but I find it to be a basically sound picture and good guide.

Agriculture

Given the rural character of the county and its farming heritage, the development of agricultural land is especially important to the overall Plan. This Plan recognizes that increasing population pressure on the County makes the development of agricultural land certain and raises the question not of ³if², but ³how²? Again, the concepts of compatibility and balance are

properly cited as a touchstones.

I am concerned about the use of the word ³incentives² in Goal #1 on page 62. The specific nature of such incentives needs to be described in the text. Also, further clarification of the distinction between the management approaches to prime agricultural land (presumably A-1) and so-called ³undeveloped² land (presumably A-2) would help to reduce current levels of confusion about the application of recommended policies.

Residential

While I largely agree with the goals outlined for this section, I think a more detailed description and examples of the ³regulations and incentives² described in Goal # 3 on page 64 would be helpful.

The recommended application of cluster subdivision requirements is probably the least well understood aspect of this section. The Plan could do more to describe the advantages of this approach especially from the perspective of the individual property owner seeking to divide and develop their land. While creating potential profit limitations for professional developers and other real estate interests, there may well be advantages for the property owner that need to be clearly described in the Plan. This topic needs further objective and less emotional study by this group.

Economic Development

The cost/benefit calculation of economic development to the County's residents and property owner, as it is reflected in their tax rates and the delivery of County services, needs to be updated beyond the 1991 reference cited in the text. More recent studies may well present an even more compelling calculus.

I am not aware of the historical relationship between this Plan and the existing County Economic Development Corporation, but, to the extent a relationship now exists, it needs to be included in the text.

The Goals described in this section largely make sense to me. I am especially supportive of #5 on page 69 that describes the adaptive re-use of existing structures because I believe the widespread desire to preserve the rural character of the County will tend to favor small business over large scale commercial enterprise or industry and adaptive re-use obviates the need for additional structures.

Rural Character

For me, this is the most important section in the chapter. The rural

character of Franklin County and the quality of life advantages it provides are the reason I moved here six years ago. I am here tonight because I believe that sensible planning is the only way to preserve that rural character against the inevitable pressures of future growth.

I particularly support Goal # 6 on page 74. Although I am not sure if cluster sub-divisions as mentioned in Goal # 5 are the only and best design option for siting new structures, it is certainly true that encouraging policies that limit curb-cuts and strip-siting will go a long way toward maintaining the rural character of the County we all cherish.

Failure to plan wisely is not an option.

The next meeting is Thursday , May 15,2008 at 7PM in the Commissioner's room at the government annex in Brookville,